

## Creation versus theistic evolution – part 2

I spent some time brethren and sisters on reasons in believing in the literality of the seven days. I realise in that statement of things, there are difficulties and problems to be understood, and time just doesn't possibly permit to cope with anything like that. But I thought that perhaps one thing should be said, it has been mentioned to me, that, going back to that point in my address, that I believe the text of Genesis 1 v1 and 2 does permit the belief that these six days of creation were only a refurnishing of the earth at that time, and at the primary creation of the earth, the sun, moon and stars belongs to ages long before that; and within the opening words – *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.* - is a statement of the position from which then this work of preparing the earth, as we now know it then proceeded, the spirit of God moving. There are many other matters there which are difficult, we must leave them.

So returning now to where we stood, in having done our best to outline bro Ralph Lovelock's thesis, it is properly condensed, on this chart and now??? look at this more carefully, now?? the time we??? go into the matter. As I say the Adam race, I've chosen to call it 'Adam a' and 'Adam b' so that we get some distinction, though one can call it, Adam race and Adam personal, belongs to some starting time????some 50,000 years ago and so the red we have here is the start of Adam and Eve as created by God, bro Lovelock????? puts it about there, but of course it doesn't alter the principal of the matter. And this shape here, is representing on this side of the line, those who intermarried and intermingled with the Adam race, the renegades as he calls them, and who being faithless, all perished at the flood. On this side of the line, keeping outside of the stream of the Adam race are the descendants of Adam and Eve who were made of clay, and by the time of the flood there was only Noah and his family. So we have, of course, bro Lovelock insisting that the flood has to be local, and the main stream of life carries on, but that the descendants of Adam and Eve are those who had intermingled and were still in the Mesopotamian basin, and the men of faith ceased or destroyed, and he starts off again with Noah, and there is an intermingling of those two by marriage through time, and from contact generally and again bro Lovelock requests that this should??????????

So having before us the thesis that Genesis chapter 1 is describing a long process of many thousands of years for the development of the Adam race, starting in primitive homo-sapiens and developing by variation, ??? variations and secondly by the influence of Adam, the information coming from Adam himself, who was in contact with God, ????? purpose gradually attaining to very good and in the image of God. And we have Genesis 2 describing Adam and Eve personal. And in this way bro Lovelock feels he is harmonising science and the Bible and coping, more or less with all difficulties.

Our interest now is to see whether this thesis is tenable in the light of scripture. Does it fit the account? Does it fit the rest of scripture? Is it consistent with the revealed doctrine of salvation? Does it fit the account? First there is a general unlikelihood of this being true, as you read the story, I don't suppose hardly any one of us in this hall ever conceived of this idea, until it was put before them on the chart tonight, or when they first read bro Lovelock's thesis. Yet all of us here have read, and re-read those chapters, many, many times. The simple reading is that Genesis 2 is an enlargement of certain parts of what is in Genesis ch1 for the purpose of???? shows what God was doing, they are complimentary and dealing with the same creation. And perhaps therefore, my first point could be posed - why hide the Adam race? There are plenty of occasions when God could have made it clear, he speaks of Adam personal. Looking at the animals, he speaks of Adam personal not having an helpmeet, but never in any of these points in the record does it say, and the people around him, or anything like that, it is complete???from the record. The second in the general noticing of the situation. One is very aware of the inadequacy of his interpretation of the symbols. We have one used there of man being made, using the figure of a potter, in fact the very Hebrew word used in this chapter, Genesis ch2 v7, God formed man of the dust of the ground, that very word form is to shape, used by the potter; and we don't have to become???? making out of mud, it is not the thought, it is language conveying obviously a miraculous matter, which we can't know the detail of how God did it, but conveying the general idea, as he was formed stage 1, stage 2 he was given life. That's how it reads to most of us, I think. And then for bro Lovelock to say 'oh no it just means there's

a common origin' but if those words used there by the spirit were symbolic language, surely the spirit would use such words as were appropriate. Now if you were describing the deriving of 'Adam personal' out of the race, by some interference of natural processes, would you use the figure of a potter? No, the figure of a potter is one of absolute creation, a forming and shaping. It is not a figure that is???? unsuitable to the idea of one man being devised out of a race, and made a bit better. And as for the phrase 'breathed into his nostrils the breath of life' which has such potent meaning, in a simple sense, he does not give any answer, nor did he when he replied at Oxford give any answer. He does not give strength and power to his interpretation.

And then when one comes to Eve, I feel the matter is still more striking. He says 'well I don't believe that this is a detailed method of how God formed Eve'. He may not think so but???? the words are plainly there. Adam goes to sleep, his side is opened, a rib is taken out?????isn't a rib. Bro Lovelocks says it's not a rib, well suppose it isn't, it is something else, but it's taken out of Adam, the flesh is closed up, and then the woman is formed, Adam comes again to life. Now if it isn't literal it's symbolic, what does it mean symbolically????? well try yourselves to make a symbol of it, I tried and I just can't. You think, other person living, Adams now alive, what symbol are we going to give, for putting him to sleep I suppose, can be something made symbolic, maybe. But opening his side, taking something out, closing up the flesh, try and make symbols of it; you can't. It just has to be taken in its' simple sense. I do say that bro Lovelock's attempt does not square with any power in his symbolic interpretation of the matters here.

As with the serpent also, we'll come to that in a moment, and third under this just general consideration, thoughts that arise??? Thesis, thirdly, one is worried and struck with the varying degree of mixture of symbol and literal, and no rules about it. Whenever bro Lovelock needs it to be a symbol, it's a symbol. Dust of the ground, breath of life is symbolic, but then the garden is literal, the tree, strangely is literal. I would have thought to make consistency he would take the whole lot symbolic if you are going to. There are no grounds of Interpretation to take some symbolically others literal. This is a great???

These are my first general thoughts, but now going to chapter 3, we do get down to the substance of his case, when he has proposed, - that the serpent that tempted Eve, we've got an answer for who the serpent is, he says, because people were living at that time and living contemporary with?????? these were the people who tempted Adam and Eve. We've got an explanation at last, - is the presentation he would give to us. And so we have to ask, does the account of the serpent here, taken as a symbol, fit? We notice as we read the account in Genesis 3 that the serpent has a knowledge of God. He comes to Eve and he says '*Yea hath God said Ye shall not eat of the tree of the garden?*' the woman replies. Verse 4, the serpent says '*Ye shall not surely die; For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.*' So the serpent; 1, he knew about God; 2, he knew about salvation '*ye shall not surely die*'; 3, he knew about good and evil; and 4, he knew about the gods or the Elohim. He had, one might say, almost as much knowledge as Eve herself. What does bro Lovelock say; not in covenant with God; not in contact with God; not???? but actively opposed, It required a divine modification of a member of the race, to make it possible for him to have contact with God and knowledge of God. So on his own presentation of his people here, who have not the ability, or the knowledge of, or the contact with God, they don't fit the account of the serpent here, who has knowledge of God, who does know about good and evil and can talk about the matter, just as Eve did. Their???ment is somewhat similar with these matters. So clearly this one symbol that is so important to him doesn't fit. One, might further add a thought just here as we press on, how could it be with bro Lovelock's idea that only Eve was tempted. You see he isn't imaging this as something happening in a point of time, no this is a vision, condensing as in Revelation ch12 things that happen over a period of time, into a little drama, which is a picture story. And in fact, this evil influence, eventually affected Eve that she transgressed, but how could it be that only Eve was influenced? During this time Adam, made of the same nature, surely would come under the same impulse. If it is a symbol for the evil influences around in these people, why was not Adam also affected?

It's when we come to the sentence on the serpent that we come to the complete failure of bro Lovelock's thesis. The sentence on the serpent, the first is, (reading verse 14) '*Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field; upon thou belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou*

*eat, all the days of thy life.*' This remember is symbolic, allegorical. The serpent is allegorical, not literal, and the sentence he says is allegorical and symbolic. So then this teaches that there was to be from this point of time, an actual degradation of the Adam race. You cannot use the idea that the serpent is sin. Sin cannot act without an agent because thou hast done this thing, thou, who is thou? Sin can't act without an agent. The Adam race, was the embodiment, he says, of that evil. It's the Adam race that is the serpent and they must receive the sentence. And the sentence is, in the form of the curse, and going upon its' belly, and the only sense that one can give to that as a symbol is that, that race is degraded, and always cursed; always debased; always earthy; forever; all the days of the life of that race. This is the sentence upon the serpent people, the serpent people around Adam. And yet bro Lovelock has dealt with chapter 1, and shown to us that in chapter 1, man is eventually to become very good. This Adam race in chapter 1 is to gradually progress under natural variation, from the help of Adam personal, to become ultimately very good. Whereas in Genesis chapter 3, these people, described, he says, as a serpent are under a curse forever; to go upon its' belly, to be debased, to be earthy. His thesis puts these two passages of scripture in quite contradiction with one another, and it's more likely that his thesis is???? and the scriptures are a flat contradiction?????. Is it likely that in Genesis 1, you can have a people initiated by divine intervention, (in some way of natural processes, which then under natural variation, but yet with a curse upon it, to go, to be debased and earthy all its days), can eventually progress to be very good and perfect? These things are contradictory one of the other. In fact, one has the question forced upon one's attention, is there in fact a separate race in Genesis 1 as distinct from Genesis 2? The two are one, by the very reading of the chapters, they are complimentary.

It would be, I think, proper to mention bro Lovelock's defence of this drastic situation which he must have found himself in, when one examines in detail the text, and which he gave at Oxford recently. Ah, he says, the serpent of course is a symbol of evil. It is sin that was condemned, it is evil that was condemned not the people. This is foolishness, brethren and sisters. One cannot sentence an abstraction like sin. Sin does not exist, except as a reality in people acting and doing. I believe that the serpent is used symbolically in other places than this original one. It is agreed that the serpent in a number of places in scripture is used in a figurative sense. Thus what do we find: Matthew chapter 23, Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees, '*Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*' What was to escape the damnation of hell? Sin in the abstract? No, it was those individuals who were serpents, and they were to come into the dreadful judgements that were about to fall upon Jerusalem. They themselves, the embodiment of evil, were the ones to receive the sentence. Revelation chapter 12, the old dragon, there symbolically, the general nature of things, representing a political system of things, described as we know as that old serpent. There the figure of a dragon, seven heads and ten horns, a political system. And that serpent received judgement, in that chapter, what received judgement? Still in the abstract? No, it is the people expressed and the system involved in the symbol, who were the operating power of the evil. If you look at it a little more closely, as bro Lovelock would like to do, just think about it, supposing for the moment, that the serpent there could have the meaning he gives to it as sin in the abstract, or evil shall we say in the abstract. What it would be telling us then is this: that, at this point at time, God now says that evil is degraded on earth again; at this point in time; from which you must conclude that before this point in time evil was good. At this point in time, the serpent, which he says is sin in the abstract, evil, is sentenced, degraded made earthy. In scriptures, of course, sin is always evil and debasing and earthy. You cannot have it, at this point in time, becoming so. No, there is no escape, that if you choose bro Lovelock's??? of handling this, as his notes say quite clearly, I believe, if you look at them, the serpent was the symbol of the people around, and if the symbol of the people around because thou hast done this thing???? the people and they in the form of a serpent are sentenced to go upon their belly, and therefore always to be degraded and base and therefore can never, according to chapter 1 become very good. His thesis will not hang together.

One good approach to examining the matter,???? the matter of looking at the text, but comes to my mind just now??? my notes here mention. A good place to see these two distinct streams, would surely be nearer to our time. Long back, well, what can one know about it, but if in fact there are two such streams, one that did not have any benefits of this divine intervention by which the divinely modified member of the race had a potential to appreciate God and to receive law, and to have salvation given to him; if that's his

position and these haven't got that, then surely at some point in time, much nearer to us, you might say, what happens when those two people of classes meet? There must be a striking difference between them. When the missionaries go out and then the barbarians came down in the fourth century into the Roman world, when these who were of that class, come near to civilisation they must be seen to be quite different. There are obviously historical facts of such a matter. Always whenever, the word of God and Christianity carried by the missionaries to primitive people, or wherever they take them, speaking now in the general language of Christianity, and not the Truth of course, what do they find? When they meet these people, they are just the same, they've got the same faculties and potential, they are able to appreciate what's said about a God and to worship. They have reasoning powers and speech. And they have artistic appreciation of things that belong to man normally. They have also that remarkable situation of sympathy between man and wife, which was so peculiar to the second chapter of Genesis, that Eve being taken out of Adam has a relationship to him a, helpmeet, sympathy and dependant. This is found in all the other people. In fact when they meet they are found to be the same people. They are the same race.

Coming back to the text, and where we???? are. And it arises from what I have just been saying, this question of Adam and Eve, man and woman. Genesis chapter 2 gives the detail of why woman is woman out of man. Because she was taken out of him and has that dependence and relationship and sympathy with him. Woman, man, woman, male, female. But is this peculiar to chapter two? No, look back to chapter one verse 26 – *'Let us make man in our image'*, verse 27, *'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them'*. So the very peculiar thing of chapter two, that he refers to Adam personal is in fact found also belonging to the making of man in chapter 1, it must be the same. And this is very strongly supported by some words of Jesus, and it's worth our spending time to look it up, Mark ch10, it's just the particular form of the words he use. Mark 10 v6, when they are tempting Jesus regarding putting away and divorce, and you remember his reply – v6 *'But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female'* - not a process of making, from the beginning of the creation male and female. So the male and female matter of Genesis 2 is a thing that belongs to the beginning of creation,???? bro Lovelock that was back here. The Bible says that, that event and that event are the same, they are one race.

Now passing from this looking at a few of the matters in the account itself, which so abundantly to my mind shows that this thesis does not square. We pass on briefly to look at a few points in the rest of scripture, as to whether his thesis will stand. First, again in the wider sweep of the Bible one must be struck with the absence of any reference to this other race, the Adam race as distinct from the descendants of Adam and Eve. It's rather like the immortal soul I feel, were so many people say 'yes I'm sure there is an immortal soul, I'm sure the Bible talks about it' and we say well no it doesn't you won't find it there. And the same with this matter there is no record. Second there is the matter of the flood in Genesis 6-9. In these several chapters, there is a tremendous emphasis that it was all flesh that perished, all creatures that had life, all the mountains under the heaven were covered, and if you choose to read right through you are impressed with the tremendous reiteration, in fact ten times in these three chapters does it press the point **all**. Now one appreciates that 'all' sometimes used when not everything is meant, it says that Israel worshipped under every green tree and upon every high hill, it may not mean exactly every, but it does mean most, clearly and all is used in that sense there. Not just a little bit like the Mesopotamian valley as distinct to the rest of the world, bro Lovelock insisting, or having to insist that the flood was very local. And one does recognise, secondly, that 'all' is sometimes used in a limited context. That 'all' may be 'all' of a certain class in a certain situation; but taking those two matters into account, when one reads through these chapters, it is all flesh, all creation, everything that has life. There is a totality about it. If you'll read with me just a little, we can't read all, but just take chapter 7, to get the sense of this emphasis, v4 – *'For yet seven days, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights and every living substance that I have made will I destroy from of the face of the earth'*. V 19 *'and the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered'* v21 *'And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man; All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land died'*. This **all** under heaven, **all** on the dry land and bro Lovelock keeps on

saying 'no it's just the little bit in the middle east, nowhere else' v23 *'And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth'*. Only Noah survived. If you read through all those chapters you'll find that's the character of its emphasis and I think one cannot escape the sense of totality that is conveyed. When bro Lovelock replied to this point, he apparently had been impressed and he repeated a number of times, I do agree it does sound like it's all universal, but he says I'm sorry, we can't believe that it's universal, because of certain archaeological evidence of the civilisations in the Egyptian valley. That was the difficulty.

The Bible means what it says is my own answer. Of course if one wanted to counter what he said about archaeology in the Egyptian valley, one could say yes and science has some very striking proofs of the totality of the flood, of those elephants who were found right in the Siberian regions, complete flesh bones and everything, living in a luxurious, tropical climate, overcome, overwhelmed and still found and brought out in the beginning of this century, dramatic proof of the universal character of the flood and the wide spread of civilisation before the flood. But we are not arguing that tonight. Just pressing what the scripture requires and says. And just before we leave Genesis and the flood, there is a phrase I draw your attention to in chapter 9 and verse 6 *'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man'*. Bro Lovelock says 'no he's making man, its going on, let us make man in our image and in our likeness, is a process going on into the future. Moses says in this statement looking back from the flood, God made him in his image. A thing done at the time and therefore creation and not theistic evolution. In the image of God itself, is a word that expresses the idea of the shape, and general issues of form and outward appearance.

Now in the New Testament, there's just two scriptures I would briefly, only one I've jotted down here, that's the rather well-known one in 2 Corinthians ch11 where Paul does speak of the serpent tempting Eve, and this must therefore be of considerable importance bearing on this subject. The second of Corinthians 11 and verse3, He wishes the church to be as a chaste virgin for Christ *'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ'* So he's drawing a parallel, as the serpent beguiled Eve, so they should be beguiled, by what? And if you read through this chapter, you must do it at your leisure, you will find that it says in v13, there are certain false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves as apostles of Christ, and they were in the ecclesias. They got hold of ideas that were Greek philosophy, these false teachers had knowledge of God and they were in the ecclesias, beguiling the believers. Now if bro Lovelock is right and the serpent is representing these people around Adam, who had no contact with God, no covenant with God, were not seeking God, had no ability to know God, how inappropriate of Paul to use this symbol. He's using it of people who did know about God, who were within the ecclesias and the wording of Paul here, does suggest as I myself said earlier on, the serpent, as I believe made by God, with reasoning powers and speech, knew what had been said in the garden, and did know about God. This use of Paul of the parallel does not fit with the serpent of bro Lovelock's thesis, (of people around who had no knowledge).

Leaving the rest of scripture, there are one or two other passages which are not very important, we must next pass to the important matter, does his thesis square with the revealed doctrine of salvation, and in particular, what we find in Romans chapter 5? See the basic situation, we all know I'm sure, is that all men, are subject to sin and death through Adam, and therefore on that basis there is Jesus Christ in whom there is salvation from that condemnation. That we have bro Lovelock having a vast number of people who don't come from Adam personal, these people die, just because that's how they are from long hereditary, whereas these in the presentation of Paul die because they are under condemnation of sin through Adam. Totally different, an important difference, we might just read perhaps before we proceed further, what he does say in Romans chapter 5 so that we are quite clear, a little bit of Romans 5, verse12 *'Wherefore'* he has been speaking earlier of Jesus Christ, and the salvation, reconciliation in Jesus there, *'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death, by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;'* He repeats this a number of times as you know, v 17, 18 and 19, *'if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation'* so in Jesus Christ unto eternal life, this he repeats again, his whole case is based upon the

fact, everybody is in Adam, under condemnation under, sin, under death, and in Christ a new ???? Now this of course is a very real difficulty for bro Lovelock; all his people, are not in Adam, under sin, under condemnation, where so they stand? Outside the hope of salvation? No he doesn't wish to say that. But he makes an approach to deal with this by saying that, as Jesus Christ is a representative man, and all are in Jesus Christ, so Adam is a representative man, and we must regard all as in Adam. He says, well Jesus Christ was different from us in some ways and yet we are classed as all in him. Why should it not be therefore, that though the Adam race were less and different from Adam personal, they could nevertheless be regarded as in him. So he reasons through half a page, in his notes that Adam was representative of all. They were all in him. If this could be true, it would perhaps help bro Lovelock over a difficult??? A basic and important ??? So we must now ask is this true? Is there a parallel? As we are all in Christ, so these others, who were coming from a stream before Adam, can be in Adam. The answer is there is not a parallel between the two. Now just think about Jesus first as a representative man. Jesus as a representative, there are two features; first that he has in common with us the things that matter; our fallen state, our need for salvation, what the Bible calls our unclean nature. He has these important things in common with us. ????? in that way obviously can be a representative; secondly in those things in which he is different from men. In those things in which he is different, it is essential that we fully identify ourselves with his different position. ??? We are not righteous in reality, but we have, every one of us to mentally understand where we are, understand what is sin, and what is righteousness, understand what is the eternal life in him and identify ourselves with his position. We identify ourselves with his position by what we believe, and finally we do it by actual baptism, by which we join with his death and we rise with his new life. We make ourselves one with him, in this matter, as much as possible in us. And then God by Grace, classes us with him. So he is very much a representative man for us, having in common our form, our state and the things we need, and we place ourselves with him in the things in which he differs and is above us. Now are there parallel things, as bro Lovelock would like, in relation to Adam personal and the Adam race? The answer emphatically is no. First of all in the things that matter, they are different, not??? in common, the Adam race hasn't got these faculties of appreciating God, of receiving law, of being attuned to the things of God. That had to be a divinely modified member of the race to provide that. So in the things that matter, they have not got this relationship, and secondly they have not got the consciousness of the fall of man, they're not in the fallen state, because they haven't fallen. They haven't got in common that which is the fallen state, and secondly in the things that are different with Adam, what do they do about it? Do they identify themselves with how he is different, no they are ignorant of the things that are different. They do not associate themselves with Adam or his position, they do not know of it. You cannot make Adam a representative, because he just isn't there as a representative. And it's just a grasp of an idea to try and get over a difficulty, to propound that he is a representative of people who have had no contact with the things of God. But answering questions on this afterwards bro Lovelock made some attempt first of all to say 'oh yes but of course they've all inter-mingled, and inter-married, so they're all one now'. But when he was asked, yes but what about the time before they did, when they were quite separate? To that there was no suitable answer.

So then bro Lovelock's thesis is not tenable in this basic matter of salvation. But Paul requires all flesh, all men to be in Adam, to derive the fallen state from him and to propound a second stream of life that does not have that position, surely is very fundamentally outside of Paul's reasoning. The fact is of course that this race that he proposes coming on from a stream of time some 50,000 years ago is not recognised by the Bible, it does not exist, it is not there.

Time goes rapidly and now therefore leaving the very brief analysis of his thesis in the light of scripture, I wish to conclude with a little time on some reflections, implications of his thesis??? reflections on this thesis and a final overall assessment. My first reflection is this, it concerns the quality of the reasoning which is presented in his thesis, and surely in a broad view, this is very disturbing. Here we have a most important matter of the origin of things presented to us with an almost complete failure of the thesis to harmonize with the Bible, and this is being put forward by one of our leading brethren. Such looseness of reasoning and handling of scripture, assuredly will lead us to darkness, brethren and sisters, if we pursue this path. We have been noted as a community, in the last century and on down into this century, as a people who hold the truth, people who show tremendous care, tremendous diligence, finding out the

fitness of things from the bible, finding the truth. Being as it were scientific about the word of God. And what we have from bro Lovelock is not like that at all, in fact one might put it this way, that if bro Thomas had used such a quality of reasoning, he would never have found the truth at all. To those of us who that feel we must maintain the truth, surely this quality of reasoning and approach must be kept off the platform. It is surely a serious matter too that bro Lovelock is in the centre of our community in the Christadelphian Office, and one can but hope that with the increasing awareness of what he is propounding, there will be a climate of opinion that will bring pressure that will bring pressure to bear in this direction. A quality of reasoning that will take us soon into darkness.

My second reflection is this, we've had to spend our time in a lot of detail about his thesis to show it doesn't fit, but apart from the detail there's the broad sense of it, this theistic evolutionary idea. The idea that though there is a God, (there is a creator), he would use the word, with divine intervention at times, there is yet an evolutionary development by natural variation. This strikes one, with a knowledge of the Bible, as not in harmony with the character of God as he is revealed. I admit that is a statement of opinion, and yet one can put together, so much scripture, such as I have briefly quoted, as in the psalms; he commanded it was done; that sense of power that outstretched arm; that doing is so different. A different God, God is taken away from us with this half evolutionary, half creative presentation. True bro Lovelock uses the word create but it seems to me he misuses it. The sense of things such as we have them in the many miracles of the Bible and in those comments so frequently by the inspired writing of his overseeing power and action. And when one thinks that very shortly on this earth, it will come to pass, that thousands, nay millions of people, dead, will in fact in a brief period of time be reshaped into beings, when each receive, life from God and live and this shall be by resurrection. How can we have this origination of things in Genesis 1 and 2 ??? an evolutionary process. When surely for the very heart of our belief that God's action for the creation of his men, his men again shall be by dramatic power by dramatic power real rapid creation in the day of the resurrection. My general reflection on is this theistic evolution??? is very worthy of Christianity outside, let alone our own community.

My third reflection is concerning the amount of radicalising that has been introduced and the blurring of the apparent sense of words. One is truly left bewildered that the plain sense of words is not used and is bluntly put on one side. We've been over it already, the word regarding the forming of Adam, the word regarding the forming of Eve, these are outstanding, but yet again in many, many little details, one finds that bro Lovelock in unfolding his mind, will be giving some unusual interpretation, and what not one might obviously think, because his thesis needs it. As for instance when it says 'Eve was called the mother of all living' so what, the mother of all living, surely then all came from Adam. Oh no, mother of all living from Adam??? you say and so you have this use of words that one wanders just what it may mean. And the passing comment of how much in the whole of the notes, there is such vagueness, so dozens and dozens of times 'I think perhaps it may be so, I do not know' and yet there seems to emerge such concrete suppositions as we can condense into a chart.

This allegorising, of ideas in the scripture, is a process that has been going on and is been going on in our midst, brethren and sisters, and even in the prophets and the like, we do sometimes now get the apparent sense put on one side and surely introducing this into the beginning of the record, make it all vision and account of allegory, with some historical sense behind it, will open up a way for all others on the same path to allegorise as much as they wish. One might for instance think of the coming out of Egypt, when one will say 'oh yes they came out of Egypt, but it wasn't an historical fact but you might think this wilderness journey wasn't literal, God used a picture of coming out of Egypt and going through a wilderness, and all these things that happened through 40 years were a picture allegory to convey to us that life is a wilderness journey, that the way to the Kingdom is a path of struggle and obedience; but it didn't really happen like that of course, God didn't actually have this miracle walk in the wilderness'. ??? some reason like that perhaps, why not if we do it in the beginning? And indeed the very basic matter I have referred to, the resurrection, we know what the churches say about resurrection – 'oh yes we believe in the resurrection' – and when you ask them what they believe, 'oh I don't really mean a body coming to life again, of course, I mean well, it means you go on, you go on living' ??? that is foolishness, but we are going in that path, if we pursue such a way of handling the scripture, as we have from bro Lovelock.

My fourth reflection is this, one is very concerned with his uncritical acceptance of science. So called science of course. Without doubt there is a vast amount of reasonably established scientific fact, no one in his senses would say otherwise, and especially in the exact sciences of biology, physics and chemistry, there are mountains of observations, of deductions and reasonable facts. But in this field in which we are concerned, of evolution, this is not the case. It is not possible, in the field of archaeology and anthropology, to have full scientific method brought to bear, and one can never therefore be certain of facts. You can have observations. You can observe the popular matter of the moment, carbon 14, isotopic carbon, you can take a parcel; you can do laboratory experiment; you can feel fairly certain that you know what amount of carbon 14 there is, but that doesn't prove a date long ago. To get that date has to involve certain assumptions. You have to have an assumption as to what amount of carbon 14 there was there originally; you have to have an assumption of the rate of decay of carbon 14 through the period of time. You can say I hope it's the same then as it is now, but ?????? You can never be certain in this field. And this is not being unkind to science, this is an obviously accepted point that in these fields of investigation of long ago, you cannot know exactly. On this very matter of Carbon 14 it has well been pointed out, that there is considerable evidence, that before the flood, the state of things on the earth was different, and that probably there was more an envelope round the earth of more water vapour than there is now and if it were so, the amount of carbon 14 absorbed by plants would be quite different, and you would be completely lost now in trying to make deductions. However much you try, you just don't know, and to pitch that against the authority of the Bible is just foolish. But it isn't only that in this field of science you can't bring to bear exact science, there are other matters. In this field of the evidence, of then origin of man, that bro Lovelock takes so wholeheartedly, one must consider the meagreness of the evidence upon which they found it. Take just two well-known skulls, the Piltdown skull, nine cranial bones, half a jawbone and a tooth. Or the well-known Java man, a skullcap, teeth and a femur. And out of the small bits they get, they build a whole story, filling in the rest themselves. And it's only one found, not many, only one person goes to see it, not a lot of people, there's not checked evidence. And as probably, some of you know, there have been outrageous scandals in these matters, of deception, because these men have tried to make stories to fit their thesis of evolution, that have been false. Piltdown skull was exposed in 1953 was it? When by the Fleury method it was shown that other parts brought together to form the one skull, were not all from the same thing anyway, some was human, and some was not, and eventually it was known to be a hoax. And perhaps more striking than that, in the Java man, when the Dutchman Dubois went out there in 1885 and brought back this wonderful proof, he brought back a lot of other skulls as well and he shut them up in a cupboard and nobody knew anything about it for twenty years, and eventually the truth came out, when they got to know about the other skulls, and when the other skulls were examined in fact some parts were human. And there is plenty of evidence that he had hoaxed them by picking out that one and saying it stands alone, when actually it was mixed up with a lot of other kinds, which showed it wasn't what he claimed it to be and in fact actually???? on, it was said to be a giant gibbon, it wasn't a man at all. If this is the quality of the men who are handling this, aren't you going to worry yourself very much about it? Admitted there are some facts of science, but this is the sort of difficulty you will find yourself in if you try to follow this path. I say therefore it is no violation of true science, to be very critical of the welter of evidence, so called, brought before one. To my mind we may very well find if when Christ comes, on matters known in fact, we may very well find, that they divide themselves up into two simple classes, those fossils which are just apes and animal type, and those others who looking like homo-sapiens are in fact descendants from Adam. And it is interesting that some men of science are willing to say this. In the quite interesting book of Filby, Dr Filby, 'Creation Revealed', I don't recommend the reading of the book, but at the end of it, he goes through all the evidence of these skulls, with the just the same interest as bro Lovelock, he's a man who believes in God and he eventually comes to the conclusion, looking at them all, he says he probably expects to find that there wasn't this view of a race before Adam, but that all these will be explained as being after Adam. There is also the better known book of the Genesis flood of Whitcombe and Morris, who have propounded the very interesting view that in fact all these fossils and all these skulls and the like have been formed through the catastrophic flood itself in which everything was so mixed up and engulfed by the tremendous upheavals of that time. This is not proof, I am just indicating that men who have scientific degrees and interest, are all debating different things. There is also the evolution protest movement, they have their various books, there is Dewares(?) very interesting book and



lots of smaller pamphlets. In fact the point of greatest interest is that the more evidence that is coming forward in our present time, the less people feel there is evidence for evolution. And therefore surely we do not need to be much concerned about these doubtful, debateable matters, there may be many difficulties, when we have the word of God.

So with those four reflections, the last one being, as I have said, one's great concern in the way in which bro Lovelock takes so wholeheartedly so many, so called facts that in many cases prove not to be facts, and we need not concern ourselves with them. This approach that looks uncritically at science around us and the men of science who have the fashion of philosophy of evolution bred in them leaving that and the other reflections, my final overall thought is this; Our present position, our present malady is our insufficiency of faith; and when I say faith I do not mean credulity, I mean faith. I mean that faith that Paul speaks of in Hebrews chapter 11, the faith by which the worthies of old stood, and they knew where they stood, they had conviction, they were assured that God is and a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. A faith which comes to us only, by that daily prayerful continual imbibing of the word of God. Knowing it all giving attention to the Law of Moses, to the judgements, the precepts and the righteous acts of God. Pondering the path of the Kings of Israel and what God said. Entering prayerfully into the thought of the psalmist. Going with the prophets and seeing the kingdom and their own reflections on the things God has done before. And the marvel and wonder of Jesus Christ himself, the son of God. And so on into the last book of the Bible and that wonderful testimony through two thousand years of God's hand amongst the nations. His power working. By this means we shall draw nearer to God, we shall live nearer to God, we shall live???? His presence, and if this be so we shall have trust in God and his word, we shall take in its' plain sense, we shall know as, I said at the beginning, he has written it to be understood in its' plain language.

We shall not counter our present state, brethren and sisters in which in this field of the matter, science is it were is sweeping and ebbing through our midst. We shall not counter it by a closer study of science or by more knowledge and facts of science. No, we needn't worry much about that, for God has told us that we ought not to worry about it, he looks to us to be???? in this matter and to develop that trust in his word. But saying that, let me express sympathy indeed, and true sympathy for our many young brethren and sisters who because it has come their lot, maybe not largely, but it has become their lot as it was my lot, apparently, to have this contact with science when you are young, I do appreciate the difficulties you have. The difficulty really lies in being able to take the point of view that I can take after nearly forty years. And not being so readily beguiled by science, so called. The science that comes before you as apparent authority and apparent truth, is so often not so. That finding real truth isn't so difficult, that when you grow older and learn the ways of men, even scientist, and their lack of moral integrity, on occasions, you cease to assume that what is called scientific fact is so. That you can only learn as you grow older. Probably the only thing that really will help is along this line of more time for the Bible and perhaps less time for science.